

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION OCT 7-1941

Volume 1, No. 17

October 6, 1941

\$1.50 per year DETROIT cents per copy

America and the Enslaved Nations

THREE is increasing evidence that the attitude of the enslaved nations of Europe toward America is characterized by two partially contradictory tendencies. They are on the one hand grateful to us for the material help which we are giving to embattled Europe at the present time and for the moral and spiritual influence of America in the World War period, which contributed to the establishment of the independent nationhood of many of these smaller nations. But they are, on the other hand, apprehensive about the American attitude today and fearful that we will express our sense of responsibility toward them merely in acts of charity, while remaining essentially irresponsible toward the task of defeating the terrible tyranny which holds them in slavery.

We know the bitter sorrows of these struggling peoples; the agonies of body and spirit, the cries of the children,—hunger, privation of every kind. We know about these things and we are sure that we are ready to help. We send the Red Cross. We take care of refugee children. We even receive other refugees, and willingly, provided they don't compete in our special lines. We applaud plans for feeding the small democracies and grumble a bit that the British government as well as our own finds it an impracticable scheme.

But we hate to face the fact that all this is not the essential thing in the minds of these struggling and oppressed nations. They look to us not only for food, though they need it; not only for material help for their fighting forces, though they need it. They want us to share life with them; to realize our common heritage; to give them "ourselves" and not just the overplus of our plenty. To those of us who had the privilege of knowing at first hand some of the smaller nations of Europe during or immediately after the first World War, nothing was more touching than their faith in America. They looked to us as the hope of the future world. They felt that the world had become safe-for-democracy because America had come into it. It was that misplaced trust

which made one's grief so poignant at the repudiation of our responsibility, at our desertion at the critical moment. "We are safe now" said the great Meletios in Athens in 1919. "The Orthodox Church can again take its place in evangelizing the world. America has made the world safe." And America deserted.

With the same feeling the small nations look to us today. Talk with Czechs or Greeks, with Jugoslavs or Norwegians; read the papers which they print here in America and always the same story is clear. Strange as it sometimes seems in view of the past, save for an occasional cynic they do believe in us. But what they want, as we have said, is not only our food, not only our munitions; but ourselves. That sounds a bit like Church campaigns for money. But even if it is too "pious" for use in the world of politics, it is true; for what it means is that we should frankly recognize that we belong in the same world, are part of the same family, still have faith in God and the dignity of man, and must share with them the problems and tasks of the world.

Of course the America First reply is obvious. Everyone knows that nations are selfish. These other countries want us in order to use us. They will throw us over at any moment if it serves their own interest.

Now that obvious reply has much truth in it. Governments must think in terms of national interests. Governments like nations rarely rise to long-range unselfish action. The present situation is a case in point. The British, French, American governments must all have had some vision of the truth that makes and keeps men free. They chose to close their eyes. But the question here is not concerning governments but concerning Christians. A Christian does not limit his love to those who will give theirs in return. Christ did not die for saints; he died for sinners. Cannot American Christians see this? Can they not see that it is their task to try to bring something of that spirit and purpose into the nation? They do not seem to see this. Well-fed for the most part, secure

from bombs, wrapped in their own affairs, they hear the cries from across the sea. And they answer "We must mind our own business; we will not send our boys to be killed; we are ready to help with bread; we will hold aloof from the conflict and so bring a sober impartial mind to the peace conference; we will urge a negotiated peace! for they utter that weirdest of all the outpourings of Christian pacifism, 'We cannot fight for we would wish to receive Hitler if he comes as a brother, not as an enemy.' In short, we want what they want; but we will risk nothing to get it."

And so they ease their consciences, these many Christians, by helping the Red Cross, by holding meetings to discuss peace aims, by approving the Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration, and most of them by backing the defense program, always provided it involves no real risk, no too high taxes, and stops

short before there is any chance of overseas adventure.

It all helps us to ease our own consciences; but how does it look to the small peoples ground under the worst tyranny the world has ever known, to the people of Britain and the free democracies fighting for a free world (our world), to the governments of Norway and Holland and all the rest as they bind themselves to fight to the end, to fight until this evil thing is swept from the face of the earth?

The question is not asked of the isolationist Senators or the *Chicago Tribune* or the America First backers as such. It is asked of Christians, pacifist Christians, America First Christians, Defending America by Aiding the Allies Christians. It is asked of any and all Christians as such. How would it look to us if we were in their place?

On Anti-Semitism

JACQUES MARITAIN

I HAVE already spoken of anti-Semitism many times. I never would have thought that I would have to do so in connection with anti-Semitic laws promulgated by a French government—which are a denial of the traditions and the spirit of my country. I am well aware that these decrees have been adopted under German pressure and through the machinations of Laval. I also know that the French people by and large are astounded at and disgusted with these laws. The fact remains, however, that the Vichy leaders have enforced anti-Semitic laws in a more and more strict and iniquitous fashion, depriving French Jews of every governmental and cultural position, imposing upon them all kinds of restrictions with regard to liberal and commercial professions, mercilessly striking many of them who were wounded for their country during the present war, and hypocritically trying to hide a bad conscience under a pseudonational pathos in which religious and racial considerations are shamefully mixed up. A small part of the bourgeoisie and the country gentry, poisoned by filthy newspapers, is letting itself be permeated by racist baseness. Anti-Semitic German films are shown in movie-theaters even in the unoccupied part of France, and we have been told that a Catholic periodical was suspended for one month for having boldly protested against such an action. Despite

innumerable private testimonies of help and solidarity given—often at great risk—to persecuted Jews, despite innumerable touching signs of friendship and fidelity which dismissed Jewish professors received from their students, no public protest has been made by any educational body, and some new corporative institutions, among the liberal professions, are willingly admitting a kind of *numerus clausus*.

The psychic poisons are more active than the physical ones; it is unfortunately inevitable that, little by little, many souls should bow down. If the anti-Semitic regulations and propaganda are to endure for some years, we may imagine that many weak people will resign themselves to the worst; they will think that after all the concentration camps are more comfortable for their neighbors than the Jews say, and finally they will find themselves perfectly able to look at or contribute to the destruction of their friends, with the smile of a clear conscience (life must go on!). I have firm confidence in the natural virtues and the moral resistance of the common people of France. I know we must trust them, yet it is not only in thinking of the Jews, but in thinking of my country that I feel horrified by the anti-Semitic corruption of souls that is being furthered in France by a leadership which still dares speak of honor.

Christianity and Anti-Semitism

It is also for Christianity that I fear. Perhaps the danger is greater in countries which have not—not as yet—experienced Nazi terrorism. We have been told that in some countries of South America anti-Semitism is spreading among some sections of Catholic youth and Catholic intellectuals, despite the teachings of the Pope and the efforts of their own Bishops. It is impossible to compromise with anti-Semitism; it carries in itself, as in a living germ, all the spiritual evil of Nazism. Anti-Semitism is the moral Fifth Column in the Christian conscience.

"Spiritually we are Semites," Pius XI said. "Anti-Semitism is unacceptable." I should like to emphasize in this paper the spiritual aspect of this question.

May I point out that the most impressive Christian formulas concerning the spiritual essence of anti-Semitism may be found in a book recently published by a Jewish writer, who seems himself strangely unaware of their profoundly Christian meaning. I do not know whether Mr. Maurice Samuel shares even in Jewish piety; perhaps he is a God-seeking soul deprived of any definite dogmas, believing himself to be "freed" from any trust in divine revelation, either of the Old or the New Covenant. The testimony that he brings appears all the more significant. Because prophetic intuitions are all the more striking when they pass through slumbering or stubborn prophets, who perceive only in an obscure way what they convey to us.

"We shall never understand," Mr. Maurice Samuel says, "the maniacal, world-wide seizure of anti-Semitism unless we transpose the terms. It is of Christ that the Nazi-Fascists are afraid; it is in *His* omnipotence that they believe; it is *Him* that they are determined madly to obliterate. But the names of Christ and Christianity are too overwhelming, and the habit of submission to them is too deeply ingrained after centuries and centuries of teaching. Therefore they must, I repeat, make their assault on those who were responsible for the birth and spread of Christianity. They must spit on the Jews as the 'Christ-killers' because they long to spit on the Jews as the Christ-givers."¹

The simple fact of feeling no sympathy for the Jews or being more sensitive to their faults than to their virtues is not anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is fear, scorn and hatred of the Jewish race or people, and a desire to subject them to discriminative measures. There are many forms and degrees of anti-Semitism. Not to speak of the demented forms we are facing at present, it can take the form of a supercilious nationalist and aristocratic bias of pride and

¹Maurice Samuel, *The Great Hatred*, New York, 1940.

prejudice; or a plain desire to rid oneself of competitors; or a routine of vanity fair; or even an innocent verbal mania. In reality no one is innocent. In each one the seed is hidden, more or less inert or active, of that spiritual disease which today throughout the world is bursting out into a homicidal, myth-making phobia, and the secret soul of which is resentment against the Gospel: "Christophobia."

Léon Bloy said that the "veil" to which Saint Paul refers and which covers the eyes of Israel, is now passing "from the Jews to the Christians." This statement, which is harsh on the Gentiles and on the Christian distorters of Christianity, helps us understand something of the extensive and violent persecution of which the Jews today are victims, and of the spiritual upheaval which has been going on for years among many of them, denoting deep inward changes, particularly in respect to the person of Christ.

Christ and Modern Judaism

The growing solicitude in Israel's heart for the Just Man crucified through the error of the high priests, is a symptom of unquestionable importance. Today in America representative Jewish writers like Sholem Asch and Waldo Frank, are trying to reintegrate the Gospel into the brotherhood of Israel. While not yet recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, they do recognize him as the most pure Jewish figure in human history. They themselves would be disturbed to be considered as leaning toward Christianity. Yet while remaining closer than ever to Judaism, they believe that the Gospel transcends the Old Testament and consider it a divine flower issuing from the stem of the Patriarchs and the Prophets. Never forgetful of the conflicts of history and of the harsh treatment received by their people, the authors of *Salvation* and of *The New Discovery of America* have long known and loved mediæval Christianity and Catholic spiritual life. They agree with Maurice Samuel that "Christophobia" is the spiritual essence of the demoniacal racism of our pagan world. Many other signs give evidence that Israel is beginning to open its eyes, whereas the eyes of many self-styled Christians are blinded, darkened by the exhalations of the old pagan blood suddenly, ferociously welling up once more among Gentiles.

"Jesus Christ is in agony until the end of the world," said Pascal. Christ suffers in every innocent man who is persecuted. His agony is heard in the cries of so many human beings humiliated and tortured, in the suffering of all those images and likenesses of God treated worse than beasts. He has taken all these things upon Himself, He has suffered every wound. "Fear not, my child, I have already travelled that road. On each step of the abominable

way I have left for you a drop of my blood and the print of my mercy."

But in the mystical body of the Church, the surplus humanity which Christ finds in each of the members of this His body, is called upon, insofar as each is a part of the whole, to participate in the work of this body, which is the redemption continued throughout time. Through and in the passion of His mystical body, Christ continues actively to perform the task for which He came, He acts as the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind.

The Fellowship of Suffering

Israel's passion is not a co-redemptive passion, achieving for the eternal salvation of souls what is lacking (as concerns application, not merits) in the Saviour's sufferings. It is suffered for the goading on of the world's temporal life. In itself, it is the passion of a being caught up in the temporal destiny of the world, which both irritates the world and seeks to emancipate it, and on which the world avenges itself for the pangs of its history. This does not mean that Christ is absent from the passion of Israel. Could He forget His people, who are still loved because of their fathers and to whom have been made promises without repentance? Jesus Christ suffers in the passion of Israel. In striking Israel, the anti-Semites strike Him, insult Him and spit on Him. To persecute the house of Israel is to persecute Christ, not in His mystical body as when the Church is persecuted, but in His fleshly lineage and in His forgetful people whom He ceaselessly loves and calls. In the passion of Israel, Christ suffers and acts as the shepherd of Zion and the Messiah of Israel, in order gradually to conform His people to Him. If there are any in the world today—but where are they?—who give heed to the meaning of the great racist persecutions and who try to understand this meaning, they will see Israel as drawn along the road to Calvary, by reason of that very vocation which I have indicated, and because the slave merchants will not pardon Israel for the demands it and its Christ have implanted in the heart of the world's temporal life, demands which will ever cry "no" to the tyranny of force. Despite itself Israel is climbing Calvary, side by side with Christians—whose vocation concerns the kingdom of God more than the temporal history of the world; and these strange companions are at times surprised to find each other mounting the same path. As in Marc Chagall's beautiful painting, the poor Jews, without understanding it, are swept along in the great tempest of the Crucifixion, around Christ who is stretched

"Across the lost world . . .

At the four corners of the horizon

Fire and Flames

Poor Jews from everywhere are walking

No one claims them

They have no place on the earth

To rest—not a stone

The wandering Jews. . . ."¹

The central fact, which has its deepest meaning for the philosophy of history and for human destiny—and which no one seems to take into account—is that *the passion of Israel today is taking on more and more distinctly the form of the Cross*.

Christ crucified extends His arms toward both Jews and Gentiles; He died, St. Paul says, in order to reconcile the two peoples, and to break down the dividing barrier of enmity between them. "For He is our peace, He that hath made both one, and hath broken down the dividing barrier of enmity. He hath brought to naught in His flesh the law of commandments framed in decrees, that in Himself He might create of the two one new man, and make peace and reconcile both in one body to God through the cross, slaying by means thereof their enmity."²

If the Jewish people did not hear the call made to them by the dying Christ, yet do they remain ever summoned. If the Gentiles indeed heard the call, now racist paganism casts them away from it and from Him who is our peace. Anti-Semitic hatred is a directly anti-Christic frenzy to make vain the blood of Jesus and to make void His death. Agony now is the way of achieving that reconciliation, that breaking down of the barrier of enmity—which the madness of men prevented love from accomplishing, and the frustration of which is the most refined torment in the sufferings of the Messiah—a universal agony in the likeness of that of the Saviour, both the agony of the racked, abandoned Jews and of the racked, abandoned Christians who live by faith. More than ever, the mystical body of Christ needs the people of God. In the darkness of the present day, that moment seems invisibly to be in preparation, however remote it still may be, when their reintegration, as St. Thomas puts it, will "call back to life the Gentiles, that is to say the lukewarm faithful, when 'on account of the progress of iniquity, the charity of a great number shall have waxed cold' (Math. xxiv. 12)."³

¹Raïssa Maritain, *Chagall (Lettre de Nuit)*.

²St. Paul, *Ephes.* ii, 14–16.

³St. Thomas Aquinas, *in ep. ad Romanos*, xi, lect. 2.

Peace and the Social Gospel

JUSTIN WROE NIXON

TO NO religious group in America has this war brought more difficult moral problems than it has to those who have been reared in the tradition of "the social gospel." The influence of this tradition is so widespread that the way in which those who hold it solve their problems is likely to affect the outlook of the churches and their contribution to a more peaceful world. These problems are thus of common religious concern and to them we would devote some attention.

I

The problems we are considering had their rise in the period of the writer's youth (1900-1914), when the social gospel came to maturity in this country. The distinguishing feature of this type of Christianity was that it urged religious men to use social and political reforms as instruments with which to build a better world. In that period the international field was just as promising an area for reform as any other. It was a period of expansion in our nation's life. The Philippines had been acquired. The Open Door in China had been proclaimed, the Panama Canal was being built, a world consciousness was growing.

In 1910 Theodore Roosevelt came out for an international police force to back up the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. Congress followed this lead in a unanimous vote asking the President to appoint a Commission which would consider using the navies of the world as "an international force for the preservation of universal peace." In 1915 a movement called "The League to Enforce Peace" was organized with Ex-President Taft as its head. The general idea of such a league was endorsed by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Governors and Legislatures of more than thirty States. The bulk of the "social gospellers" were for it heart and soul. When President Wilson brought back the League of Nations from Paris it seemed the logical fruition of popular judgment in favor of erecting a structure of peace on the foundations of international authority.

But as far as America was concerned it was not so to be. Our fathers defeated the colonial isolationists in 1787 and conserved the gains of the Revolution in a Federal Union. Patrick Henry had argued against the Constitution as Hiram Johnson argued against the League, but where Patrick Henry lost, Hiram Johnson won. The League was defeated and the policy of isolation came into ascendancy in this country. The vote in the Senate against the League

marked the end of an era in the international outlook of American politics.

It also marked the end of an era in the international outlook of those who had been identified with the social gospel. The vast frustration of America's war aim—to build an international order in which justice and peace might be more secure—shattered their solidarity. Those who were most disillusioned became pacifists. Those who regarded personal pacifism as no solution for the war problem found some outlet for their international interest in working for the World Court and Disarmament. Since the nation had refused any international responsibilities which involved military action, on most projects pacifists and non-pacifists could work together.

But now a new crisis has arisen. With the fall of France the policy of isolation collapsed and as a nation we face once more the task of introducing order into a world chaos produced by the clash of naked power. What are the inheritors of the social gospel going to do now for an ordered peace? Neither group—pacifists or non-pacifists—can do much until it secures some peace within itself by facing its own problems of moral adjustment. What are those problems?

II

The moral problem of the pacifist lies in reconciling pacifist doctrine with the responsibilities for political action enjoined by the social gospel. That problem has always been difficult as the Quakers who formed the colonial government of Pennsylvania soon realized. Today it is more difficult than ever because the frustration of political peace efforts in both Britain and America has had the compensatory result of making pacifist theory more rigid.

Current pacifism affirms that the evil of military force inheres in it as a *means* regardless of its end. No pacifist, accordingly, can participate in or support its use. If someone says that such use is the lesser of two evils, the pacifist is likely to reply that the religious man is not confined to such a choice. He may choose the wholly good, if he will. Indeed he must do so, for only the good can overcome evil. Under the impact of these ideas the evil of military force has become practically absolute while other evils have declined relatively in the scale of iniquity.

This development in doctrine explains features of current pacifism which otherwise it is difficult to understand. It explains the support given by pacifists to isolationist leaders, for if the use of military force constitutes an absolute evil one should run any risk

in order to postpone invoking that evil. It explains why pacifists seek a negotiated peace in the hour of Hitler's most extended conquests, for no alternative good can compare with the cessation of open conflict. It explains their opposition to our sale of munitions to nations resisting aggression. A religious journal based this opposition on the ground that "if we provide the guns for others to shoot and the bombs for them to drop we cannot regard ourselves as morally superior to these others." Only the assumption that the moral difference between a nation at peace and one at war is so great as to exclude all consideration of the merits of the conflict, gives meaning to such a statement by sincere people.

Perhaps we may appreciate the rigid nature of current pacifism better by comparing it with pacifism of an older type. Suppose we use for this purpose the pacifism of John Bright, to whom along with John Greenleaf Whittier the editor of *The Friend* has recently referred as "the most distinguished Quakers of the nineteenth century."

What kind of a pacifist was Bright? He was a devout religious man. Whether he could have participated personally in war remains a question. To secure as large a measure of peace for his country and the world as was politically attainable was a major objective of his public career. He opposed the Crimean war, for instance, with all his might.

But when it came to the American war of 1861-65 Bright was a most important influence in preventing the British government from interfering with the prosecution of that war by the North. His motive was revealed in many speeches and letters. In 1862, for instance, he wrote to his friend Charles Sumner: "Nothing in public affairs has ever before made me so anxious as your great conflict. I wish it to end well, but I am not anxious about its ending suddenly. For the fate of your 'Black Nation' must now be decided—" Again in 1863 he wrote to Charles Villiers: "I want no end of the war and no compromise and no re-union till the negro is made free beyond all chance of failure."

Holding to much of the Quaker attitude against war, how did he justify his support of the American government in waging war? He justified it on the ground that as a responsible political leader he should act, not on the basis of private religious views shared by only a small percentage of the population, but on the basis of moral principles "universally acknowledged in this country" and with the purpose of choosing the best practicable alternative. Acting on this basis Bright was convinced that the war in America was a war the government of Lincoln could not avoid and that its prosecution to a successful end was preferable to the disintegration of the Union, the survival of slavery, and its probable extension through the tropics.

We have set the pacifism of Bright over against the doctrinaire pacifism of today because it points toward one solution of the pacifists' moral problem. We believe that if the pacifist seeks to make his personal code determinative of all his acts individual and collective, he must eschew politics with its compromises and be content with membership in a religious order expressing its beliefs in the development of individual character and in projects of personal service.

If on the other hand he wishes to participate in the collective decisions of his nation he should do it on Bright's basis, regarding himself as a trustee of generally accepted moral convictions and asking how on the level of such convictions his country can make the best choice among the practicable choices offered. Pacifists of this type are likely to divide on international issues much as non-pacifists do who have an equal concern in improving the lot of men.

It is important for pacifists to decide which of these two roads they will take, for their present rigid policy of supporting national action in international affairs only if such action does not involve military obligations leads but to cruel disillusionment. The people in Europe who cried "war is worse than Hitler" are now suffering the evils of both war and Hitler in their most terrible form. The over-tender conscience proved to be the dupe of the over-tough and the net result was only to "improve the mystery of murder."

III

The most serious moral problem of the non-pacifist who has the inheritance of the social gospel is to reconcile his ideals for a Christian society with the acceptance of military effort as a part of the continuing order of the world. As a "social gospeller" he has assumed the responsibility of participating in government. But he grew up in a period when everyone expected the activity of government in war to be abolished. Before long institutions would be set up which would save us from war once for all.

Now he knows that this is not likely to happen. He knows that in the years that lie ahead military effort will be an important factor in determining the outcome of the war and in protecting any peace that will follow. This is a tragic fact for the non-pacifist Christian. But he knows that it is a fact and he will not deceive himself. What then is his responsibility toward the military establishment he is likely to regard as essential to a tolerable society?

In the first place he must assume his full share of responsibility for the moral and religious welfare of the men in military life. This is the responsibility of non-pacifists, for it does not seem possible to serve these men adequately if one regards their work as an

absolute evil. We of the churches may say that we did not raise our boys to be soldiers, but as a part of the nation we refused to accept international obligations that would have made it unnecessary for them to be soldiers. Now they have to be, and the task of caring for them as they perform their duties is one of which the churches as yet have little conception.

In the second place the non-pacifist Christian owes it to the military establishment to be its sincere critic. If someone says that war is war and that is the end of the matter it may be replied that there have been differences between the military establishments of various countries and between the moral effects of these establishments. Armies in Germany, Switzerland and France have not been animated entirely by the same spirit. There is a type of military establishment appropriate to America's role and position in the world. We should find out what such an establishment involves. Its needs should not be exaggerated. But sound estimates of those needs are not likely to be made by those who deny them altogether.

In the third place the non-pacifist Christian will work for a program of international reconstruction that will tend to reduce the military establishment and its use to a minimum. Such a program we believe will include the following elements.

- (1) National defence in the conventional sense.
- (2) The organization and protection of a larger-than-national area of free peoples. Mr. Willkie referred to the importance of protecting this larger area of freedom in his testimony supporting the Lease-Lend Bill. Mr. Clarence Streit has been discussing possible institutions for such an area. Other proposals such as regional pacts will doubtless be made.
- (3) Some type of world organization with at least economic and judicial functions. It would have responsibility for making available to all nations the world's economic resources.

The more that economic and military controls are transferred to the institutions developed for the service of (2) and (3) above, the less of (1), national defence in the old sense, there will be.

It is along some such line as this that we may hope to develop the material and political structure needed

for expressing the Christian ideal of world fellowship. And it is only through such a structure that our soldiers may be transformed into the servants of a larger-than-national order, protecting the processes of an international community.

It is already apparent that such a program will be opposed by those in the churches who adhere to a rigid pacifism. To these people no order that represents a practicable alternative to chaos is likely to seem good enough. It will not be universal enough or democratic enough. It will serve special interests, as our Constitution in 1787 served the holders of government securities. These people talk about the surrender of national sovereignty but they would equip the new composite sovereign with neither economic sanctions nor military power, so it would turn out to be only an International Committee of Persuasion. Thus against idealistic as well as reactionary forces a better international society must struggle to be born.

From such a grim world as we see about us some of those who have been reared in the social gospel will be tempted to withdraw into a religious order which will at least preserve the semblance of an integrated Christian faith. Others who assume responsibility for government may feel that the dominant forces of the world are so raw and savage as to be unmanageable from any point of view that can be identified as Christian. They will be tempted to throw over Christianity entirely.

This article has been inspired by the conviction that a third position is possible and that non-pacifists and pacifists who are of the tradition of John Bright may explore it together. Implicit in this conviction is the recognition that we live in a world where material, political, intellectual and religious forces are bound together in the bundle of life. There is tension, now salutary and now perilous, among these forces, but the deepest law of their being, that sooner or later manifests itself, is that of cooperation.

And after all this was the faith of the social gospel as we learned it half-a-generation ago. It still seems to some of us the type of faith that promises most for the achievement of peace.

The World Church: News and Notes

Latin American Catholics Lean to Fascism

In a careful survey of Latin American cultural conditions, Harold Callender of the *New York Times* has come to the conclusion that there is a strong leaning toward Fascism among many Latin American Catholics. This is due partly to strong cultural and even personal ties between Latin America and the Latin countries of Europe. Of twenty-two Bishops in the Argentine, for

instance, two are Italian-born and eleven are of Italian descent.

"Many Catholics," declared a Catholic layman, "are predisposed to Fascism because they like order. The Spanish revolution created fear of radicalism here." A high Catholic authority in Brazil declared that the United States is held in suspicion because it is the source of "Protestant propaganda which seeks to convert Catholics in a solidly Catholic country." A Catholic layman in

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR
Chairman
JOHN C. BENNETT
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
JOHN A. MACKAY

RHODA E. McCULLOCH
FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

Rio de Janeiro offered the opinion that the suspicion in which the United States is held was due to the influence of such educators as Professor John Dewey, "who is regarded as Communist in tendency." The layman declared that Dewey's books have been burned in Rio.

Dutch Church Leader Arrested

Dr. K. H. E. Gravemeyer, general secretary of the Reformed Church of Holland, has been imprisoned by the German authorities. His offence was drafting and distributing a message to all members of the Reformed synod which was to be read from the pulpits of the Reformed churches and which explained why the church could not cooperate with the Nazi authorities.

Plight of Warsaw Jews

Official German statistics reveal the terrible plight into which the Jews of Poland have fallen. The Germans admit that in June 4,300 Jews died in Warsaw while 396 were born. In July deaths exceeded births by 3,600. Prior to German occupation the birth rate was 26 per thousand and the death rate 14 per thousand. In other words births were almost double the number of deaths.

Marc Boegner Asks for Unity

Dr. Marc Boegner, president of the French Federation of Protestant Churches, has issued an appeal for an "inter-ecclesiastical truce of the Christian churches." He calls attention to the powerful ecumenical movement embracing both the Protestant and the Eastern Orthodox Churches; but the scope of this union is, in his opinion, not enough. He appeals to Rome to join in the movement. "Much depends on the decision of the Roman Catholic Church," he writes. "Will she shut herself rigidly within her doctrine of unity? Or will she lend herself to contacts between qualified representatives of the different confessions?"

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 12-41

8

The "Sword of the Spirit" Movement

We regret to hear that the "Sword of the Spirit" movement, organized in Britain a year ago under the impetus of Cardinal Hinsley, the Archbishop of Westminster, as an interfaith movement, has become purely Catholic. This movement was launched in great meetings, addressed by the Cardinal and by Anglican and Free church leaders. It was unique because it was the first religious movement in modern times, primarily sponsored by Catholics but intended to embrace both Catholics and non-Catholics in its membership. Recently Principal Nathaniel Micklem, of Mansfield College, Oxford, has lectured in Canada and the United States under its auspices.

The movement has broken down because Protestants discovered that, according to the constitution promulgated by the Cardinal, they were to be merely associate members while only Catholics were eligible for full membership.

Excellent as was the statement of principles of the organization, it contained several statements from the very beginning which betrayed it as primarily a Catholic organization and not one which could embrace both Protestants and Catholics on equal footing. In its statement of principles it declared that totalitarian regimes had prospered by using and corrupting the idea and the discipline of the religious orders and that only by a return to this discipline could the modern world be saved.

Pastors Jailed in Germany

Twenty-six pastors of the Confessional Synod have been jailed by the German government because they examined candidates for ordination to the ministry. Many of the Confessional pastors are working five days a week and devoting only Saturday and Sunday to their religious duties. This has become necessary because the government has in various ways restricted the possibility of securing funds for the maintenance of churches.

Norwegian Churchmen Asked

The Minister of Church and Education has sent a communication to all pastors of Norwegian churches, in which he asks them to clarify their stand on the "crusade against Bolshevism." They are asked to sign and return a declaration in which it is stated: "The decisive battle against Bolshevism and atheism is now under way. Its issue will decide whether we can keep our churches or whether they will be torn down." Ministers who refuse to sign the declaration must state the reasons for their refusal and the recipients are warned that failure to make a reply will be regarded as a refusal. Considering the stout opposition which Norwegian clergymen have been offering the Nazis, it is assumed that their answers to this missive will not be favorable.

Dr. Jacques Maritain is one of the most eminent Catholic philosophers of our day. He has been in this country many times and is now a permanent resident. The subject of his article in this issue is one which is particularly close to his heart.

Dr. Justin Wroe Nixon is professor at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and a member of the board of sponsors of Christianity and Crisis.

